

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SHEPTON MONTAGUE PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY 10th OCTOBER AT 7.00pm in the VILLAGE HALL

Present: Paul Williams (Chair), John Sykes (JS), Julia Hunter (JH), Margaret Bowden (MB)(Clerk). Also in attendance were Lucy Trimnell (County Councillor) 20 members of the parish, 4 representatives from North Cadbury, Yarlington and Galhampton parish and representatives from Castle Cary, plus Paul Rawson, the Applicant for item 5.

- 1 **Apologies for absence:** Ali Willasey-Wilsey (AW), Richard Ellis (RE), Tom Powell (County Councillor)
- 2 **Declarations of interest.** None.
- 3 **Minutes of the last meeting** were signed as a correct record.
- 4 **Matters Arising:** Deferred to meeting on 13th November.
- 5 **Planning Application 23/02317/FUL and Planning Application 23/23/02318/LBC Lily Farm, Cattle Lane. Demolition of redundant farm buildings, renovation and alterations to retained buildings, erection of new buildings and associated site access, landscape and drainage works, all in association with use of the site to provide 9 units of short stay holiday accommodation (sui generis) and associated facilities.**

The Chair thanked Paul Rawson (PR) for attending and explained that Council had identified two issues of concern in relation to this application: generation of traffic and flooding. The proposed development will generate somewhere between 9 and 14 vehicles plus staff accessing the site every day, from almost none at present. He requested that the access be swept to the right, directing traffic to/from the main road, with a sign for All Routes as per the Newt car park, to discourage traffic from going through the village. PR agreed to this.

JS then gave a short presentation on the recent flooding in the village. Research and previous records show that flooding has occurred broadly every decade in the village, though the recent flood seems to have been the worst. JS explained that the Newt/Emily Estate owns the majority of the land within what would appear to be the catchment area for flood water. Council feel that a collective action of all parties – residents, businesses, land owners, is required to prevent floods happening again. It was noted that there is no mention in the planning application of recent or past flooding. PR explained the provisions in the planning proposal designed to deal with water run-off etc. and that they exceeded the planning requirements. He also said that The Newt/Emily Estate was completely open to help the village with measures shown to alleviate flooding risk in the future.

The Chair then opened the meeting to comments from the floor and PR answered questions. Many points were raised including the recent devastation of the flooding, the many developments carried out by the Newt/Emily Estate in the area in the last 10 years, the acquisition by the Newt/Emily Estate of Seart's Farm, Lily Farm and Welham Farm as well as village cottages and the subsequent reduction in homes for permanent residents. Questions were asked of PR why the barns on the site of Lily Farm were excluded from the area of this application and what plans were there for them for the future. PR stated that the Newt/Emily Estate were not intending to develop the barns and they were currently being used for livestock and silage.

After hearing the views of residents Council resolved to submit the following comments to Planning:

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

	SHEPTON MONTAGUE
Application Ref No:	23/02317/FUL and 23/02318/LBC
Address:	Lily Farm, Cattle Hill, Shepton Montague
Date of response:	13/10/23

1. Support the granting of permission	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please explain below the main grounds on which you support the proposal:		
1. Object to the granting of permission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Please explain below the main grounds on which you object to the proposal:		

Material Considerations	Explanation of Grounds
1. Overlooking, loss of privacy or overbearing/overshadowing nature of proposal	
2. Design & appearance, impact on public visual amenity	
3. Layout & density of building	
4. Effect on listed buildings and/or conservation areas	
5. Loss of trees or ecological habitats	
6. Inadequate parking and/or servicing areas	
7. Access, highways safety or traffic generation	The proposed development will generate somewhere between 9 and 14 vehicles plus staff accessing the site every day, from almost none at present. We would suggest the access be swept to the right with a sign for All Routes as per the Newt car park, to discourage traffic from going through the village.
8. Noise, smells or disturbance from the scheme	

<p>9. Flood Risk</p>	<p>Council object to the development due to the lack of any tangible infrastructure or measures on the applicant's estate which would help ameliorate the flood risk to the village. The development, together with previous significant developments on the estate** may exacerbate rather than curtail the risks.</p> <p>We note that the proposal is to remove all buildings and concrete from the east side of Cattle Hill which should reduce the run off and absorb more water, and that a surface water management scheme is included in the plan providing a large soakaway area with a restricted outlet controlling the flow into the watercourse to '<i>the maximum flow rate limited to as near as possible greenfield run-off values</i>'. However, we understand that all the water from the development, both surface and foul, ends up discharged into the watercourse /ditch running down into Higher Shepton village, where the majority of houses were flooded.</p> <p>The water from the storm also ran down across the land on which this development is proposed with a force sufficient to overwhelm the current ditch-and-bank defence running to the South, break through boundary fence panels, force cars against walls and destroy walls in Higher Shepton (as well as flooding homes).</p> <p>Local records and reports show that flooding in this area has occurred very broadly every decade (1962, 1982, 1989, 1998, 2008, 2009, 2023). This development itself will undoubtedly flood in the future.</p> <p>The 'Foul and Surface Water Drainage' report within the Application makes reference to and takes no account of recent or past flooding at all, yet The Newt/Emily Estates own the majority of the land in the catchment area.</p> <p>The Parish Council has been advised by an independent expert that the Consultant's report in this application is of questionable quality, which emphasises the importance of having an independent review of the entire catchment area. We need a well-designed flood scheme for the parish which will involve all the local landowners and community working together to prevent flooding in the future.</p> <p>The first step in this must be to halt any further development that could increase flood risk until we have either a) the section 19 report completed, (which we understand is currently in-hand), or b) a clear understanding of how and why these floods occur and an informed plan in place for future prevention.</p> <p>Should permission for this development be granted, Council asks that a condition be made of no further development of the former Lily Farm site and fields.</p> <p>** Seart's Farm, Welham Farm, Roman Villa, Roman Villa museum, private road schemes, vineyard planted on imported soil over geo-textile etc .</p>
<p>10. Other reason – please explain</p>	
<p>2. Comments only</p>	
<p>General Observations:</p>	

- 6 Planning Application 23/02307/FUL Higher Farm East Street
Change of use of agricultural building to create four commercial units use class E(g) and B8,
partial demolition of agricultural building and creation of parking and service yard.**
Consideration of this application was deferred to Extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 23rd
October.
- 7 Correspondence:** None
- 8 a.o.b.** None
- 9 Open discussion**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9 pm.

Chairman _____ Date _____